E 711
.L91
Copy 1

THE UNITED STATES IN 1899

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 22d, 1899

BY

SETH LOW

YORK PUBL. LIBY.
IN EXCHANGE

THE UNITED STATES IN 1899.

MR. PROVOST, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

A century and a half ago, the College of Philadelphia and King's College in the Province of New York were both under discussion, but neither had yet been founded. The College of Philadelphia, now the University of Pennsylvania, was chartered in 1753, and King's College, now Columbia University in the City of New York, in 1754. It is an interesting circumstance that the same man, the Rev. Samuel Johnson, S.T.D., of Connecticut, was invited by each of the young colleges to become its first President. It would seem, therefore, as if the timber out of which college presidents are made was as scarce then as it appears to be to-day! Why it was that Dr. Johnson, in the presence of such a tempting alternative, should have chosen to become the first President of King's College, I shall not attempt to say. The incident serves to show how closely the University of Pennsylvania and the University over which I have the honor to preside were related in those early days. Within a decade of their foundation, both of them were represented in a joint attempt to secure funds in England for their common benefit. The original papers relating to this transaction are in your possession. Our own records merely show that you are credited with a full and true accounting for our share of the funds so raised, about £6,000. As we were thus closely associated in origin, so the history and development of the two universities has followed parallel lines. Each being located in an important city, each illustrates the effect of a large city upon such an institution. So long as the city was small, these colleges rendered a service to the country at large second to no others. Their influence was as wide as the colonies. As the city closed about them, on the other hand, their patronage and their influence became chiefly local; because, as I suppose, their immediate surroundings were more important and there was less need and less opportunity to reach the country outside. Few people from without were willing then, as comparatively few are now, to send their sons to college, in a city, at the youthful age which ordinarily marks the beginning of college life. As the educational system of the country has developed, on the other hand, in the closing decades of

the present century, demanding opportunities for advanced instruction not only in the professions but in all branches of learning, it has become evident that, for this class of work, the location in a great city is in itself a distinct advantage. Accordingly, during the last two decades, both the University of Pennsylvania and Columbia University have attained once more to a position of national influence such as they have not held for nearly a century. It seems probable that the tide which has thus begun to turn will flow with increasing volume for many years to come, and it is not improbable that, even upon the college side of their work, these institutions, under the changed conditions of the country, may render a service in the future much more important than they have rendered in the past at any time since the early years of their foundation. This result is to be obtained, undoubtedly, by identifying the universities with the best activities of the city in which each is placed—not by attempting to hold the university aloof from the city's life. For the life apart, the country or the small city is still the better location.

As our two universities have thus been closely associated in experience throughout their history, so there is an evident link between the cities of New York and Philadelphia in the history of the nation. The Government of the United States was established by the inauguration of Washington, as President, in the City of New York in 1789. In the following year the Government was removed to Philadelphia, and was maintained here until it was moved again, in the year 1800, to the City of Washington, which was founded to be its abiding place. The City of Washington, in the District of Columbia, was founded in a district ceded to the Federal Government by the States of Maryland and Virginia in order that the capital of the country might be in territory directly under federal control. It is interesting to observe that the Federation of Australia, now in process of formation, has just adopted a similar arrangement for the solution of the same problem. The capital of the Australian Federation is to be established in New South Wales upon territory to be ceded to the Federation and to be under its direct control. Thus the wisdom of our fathers, in this particular, is curiously justified and illustrated a century after the fact.

I recall that a year ago, in this place and on this occasion, we were listening to the earnest and patriotic words of President McKinley. It was only one week after the unhappy destruction of the "Maine" in the harbor of Havana. What a page of our national history has been written since! The action of the President in attending this celebration a year

ago was characteristic of his attitude, as it seems to me, during the whole of that fateful Spring. Nothing that he could then have done would have contributed more importantly to quieting the public mind, at that juncture, than his appearance here at such a moment to speak the calm and measured words which we had the pleasure of hearing. Only one who has tried to meet calmly such an occasion, with a great burden of anxiety resting upon his heart, can have the faintest conception of the mastery of self called for by such an undertaking. I like to think that at every crisis in our national history, so many of which have marked the intervening months, the nation has had the benefit of the same self-control, the same cool judgment, and the same utter devotion to the welfare of the country. It is not necessary to claim for the President entire freedom from mistakes in order to recognize in his general bearing a very high quality of leadership.

The anxieties of the war are over, and the problems of peace resulting from the war are now upon us. No one who has lived through it can forget the exhilarating sense of gratified patriotism which marked the action of Congress and of people as the war came on. The enthusiastic response of the volunteers to the President's calls, the splendid valor displayed by our men on land and sea, the noble devotion of good women to the sick and wounded, all of these were as welcome as our victories except as our victories were themselves the fitting and natural reward of the qualities thus displayed. For these things show that the character of the nation, when thus tried in the fiery furnace of war, glowed with the brightness of pure and precious metal, and that the nation's capacity for self-sacrifice, in a large sense, is not less than it used to be. But this is not all. The mechanical skill and ready efficiency so characteristic of the American told with overwhelming effect in the overthrow of the enemy. This capacity to turn industrial effectiveness into efficiency in war, as the swift ocean steamers of the merchant marine take on themselves, upon demand, the qualities of men-of-war, is evidence that warlike power sufficient for our need is developed in peace and by peace among a people that does not suffer itself to be dismayed by difficulties or weakened by luxury.

I wish it could be also said that the American genius for organization and for business had displayed itself during the war to equal advantage. In the Navy it did. There was something as admirable as its fighting in the way in which everything that it fell to the lot of the Navy to do, was done, quietly, without confusion and with absolute success. In the Army it did not. It must in all candor be admitted that the

task of the War Department was much the heavier. It had to multiply the army ten-fold, and it had to do quickly on a large scale what it had only been in the habit of doing slowly and on a small scale. But it is precisely under such circumstances that genius shows; and we are obliged to admit that on the side of the War Department, the genius that has made our railroads the most effective in the world, the genius that is enabling our manufacturers to conquer the markets of the world, was not forthcoming. The Santiago campaign of the Army was splendidly and brilliantly successful, and if the war had lasted longer I dare say we should have had a better criterion than we have now by which to judge how much of the dreadful suffering in camp and in the field is inseparable from war at the very best. But the contrast between the work of the Navy Department and of the War Department is too great to be wholly explained away. It is as clear as the noonday sun that the organization of the War Department and of the Army is absolutely unfriendly to efficiency. The President's Commission of Investigation has pointed out some of the difficulties and has suggested some of the remedies. It remains for public opinion to see that these remedies, or others equally effective, are promptly enacted into law. I am glad that the President has appointed a Court of Enquiry to go to the bottom of the grievous charges that have been made against the Commissary Department, for it is hideously in contrast with the self-sacrificing heroism of our troops that such charges can even be mooted, much less made by the Commanding General of the Army. Now that the enquiry has been ordered, the people may well await the finding with patience and with an open mind, as a people at once too great to do injustice even to a single one not known to be at fault and too earnest to permit any who may be proven guilty either of wrongdoing or of false charges to escape the blazing fury of their wrath.

To some of our people, perhaps to many of them, the consequences to ourselves of this war with Spain seem more terrible than the dangers of the war itself. When patriots like Senator Hoar of Massachusetts and Senator Hale of Maine, not to speak of others, feel called upon to break away from their party and vote against the ratification of the Treaty of Peace, he must be a light-hearted man, indeed, who does not consider seriously the gravity of the decisions that have been made by those charged with authority by the American people to make precisely such decisions. I want to point out, if I can, why it seems to me that the decisions reached may be

accepted with a good heart, and to indicate some, at least, of the duties that flow from the ratification of the Treaty.

A century ago, John Adams was President. Washington was still alive, enjoying at Mt. Vernon his well-earned retirement; and he had just given a new evidence of his unquenchable public spirit by accepting a commission as Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States in view of a possible war with France, which was then feared. During the sessions of Congress held in your city the foundations were laid of the Navy of the United States whose achievements and traditions have made its victories of last Summer appear to be only the natural continuation of its glorious past. Truxtun and Hull, Perry and Decatur, Farragut and Porter, seem to be only other ways of spelling the names of Dewey and of Sampson.

During his presidency of eight years Washington had demonstrated the strength of the new government in various directions. He had avoided complications with revolutionary France, despite the strong and natural popular sympathy with the country which had aided so importantly in winning our own independence; he had settled outstanding questions full of embarrassing possibilities, by a treaty with Great Britain which at the time was exceedingly unpopular; he had put down by force an armed insurrection; and he had inflicted summary punishment upon the Indians, who showed a disposition to harass our Western borders.

The new government, therefore, by 1799, was fairly launched; but already new dangers began to make their appearance. The election of Thomas McKean as Governor of Pennsylvania in 1799 foreshadowed the triumph of Jefferson and the Republican or Democratic party of that day. In the eyes of the Federalists who had controlled the government from the start, this seemed like the beginning of the end. There is more than a little evidence that in the minds of some of them it seemed to forebode a civil war. All the time, the problem of slavery was embedded in the Constitution, unrecognized, indeed, in a certain sense, until 1820, but always there. In 1820 came the discussion which terminated for the moment in the Missouri Compromise. Like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, these discussions revealed the electricity in the air and suggested the coming storm. Then came nullification, and all the uneasy years attending the angry controversy about slavery; and, finally, attempted secession and the Civil War. Foreign wars with England in 1812, with Mexico in 1846, and with Spain in 1898, have tested the country in its capacity for combat against an out-

side foe; while wide-spread commercial panic and disaster in 1819, in 1837, 1857, 1873, and 1893, have tested the capacity of the people for self-control under circumstances of great domestic hardship and distress.

It may fairly be said that no period of 20 years has passed that has not brought the country face to face with some grave danger and up to some new test. Phillips Brooks once said that if a man believed that the country had escaped all the dangers which have confronted it only by a series of happy accidents, such a man would naturally be full of fear at every new peril that makes its appearance, because such a man never could tell when the country's luck might not change. If, on the other hand, said Dr. Brooks, a man believes that the country has overcome the dangers of the past because its political system is inherently sound, such an one faces every new peril with a courage born of the very dangers that have been overcome.

It is in this spirit of well-grounded courage, I think, that the people of the United States should contemplate the situation in which they find themselves placed, in 1899, by the Treaty of Peace with Spain. The advocates of ratification have been called imperialists and expansionists, and the treaty itself has been said to be in woeful contradiction with all we stand for as a nation. These are serious charges, and it behooves every man who loves his country to consider whether they are well made. Unless our treaty with Spain has been dictated by lust of empire, it is not fair to call those who advocated it, imperialists; unless it has been dictated by lust of territory, it is not fair to call them expansionists; unless a better way can be shown by which peace could have been secured, it is not just to criticise the government for accepting even unwelcome obligations that the war has brought in its train.

What then are the facts? The Congress of the United States, in demanding the withdrawal of Spain from Cuba, declared it to be the purpose of this country to secure freedom for the Cubans. There is certainly neither imperialism nor expansion in those resolutions. Up to this hour, there is not an indication that the purpose of the country, as thus formulated by Congress, will not be lived up to both in the letter and in the spirit. It is evident, therefore, that our imperialism and our expansionism, if they exist at all, are by-products; they do not represent the heart's desire. But some one will say, "Why then did we demand the cession of Porto Rico and of the Philippines? If the American people are not imperialists and are not expansionists, why should we

demand from Spain the cession of these islands?" The answer, it seems to me, is very simple, though it is not the same in both cases. If Spain had withdrawn from Cuba without war, she would undoubtedly be still in possession, so far as we are concerned, of both Porto Rico and the Philippines. The moment she compelled us to go to war in order to expel her from Cuba, it became evidently the dictate of good sense to make it impossible for future troubles to arise between us from similar causes by removing her from this hemisphere. She has been a difficult neighbor from the beginning. No one, I think, seriously criticises this decision.

It is said, however, that in the Philippines, by reason of their distance and their population, the case is different. Undoubtedly it is, and therefore the answer is different. Evidently it would have been unwise to attempt any solution of the Philippine problem which should place Spanish and American civilization side by side in control of different parts of the Philippine group. That would have been deliberately to reproduce in the Eastern hemisphere the very conditions that had just led to conflict in the Antilles. It was inevitable, therefore, that either Spain or America must leave the Philippines. We had destroyed Spain's authority there, and had also destroyed her power to re-establish it. In no fair sense of the words, under these conditions, is it just to say that in determining to make peace by securing the cession of the Philippines the United States has been animated by either the lust of empire or the lust of territory.

But some say that the islands should have been surrendered to the natives under a joint protectorate. It is urged that our action, in demanding a cession of the Philippine Islands to ourselves, is comparable with what the action of France would have been if, at the end of the Revolutionary War, France had made peace with England by demanding the cession of England's American colonies to herself. Leaving out of account the fact that France had entered into formal alliance with the Colonists to aid them in securing independence, it seems to me, rather, that the demand of those who seek a joint protectorate for the natives is like a demand on the part of France, had she made it, that England's colonies should be left to the Indians under a joint protectorate. It is impossible, in such affairs, to leave out of account the demonstrated capacity of a people for self-government. Undoubtedly, the United States should, and undoubtedly we shall, give to the natives of the Philippines as great a measure of self-government as they are capable of exercising; but we could not, in justice to civilization assume, in our treaty

with Spain, a capacity for civilized government on the part of the natives which has never been shown to exist. It was the same Jefferson who wrote in our Declaration of Independence that government ought to rest upon the consent of the governed and who argued for a strict construction of our national constitution, that purchased Louisiana from Napoleon without the consent of the people sovereignty over whom was thus transferred to the United States; and also without any other constitutional authority than that which has been exercised in connection with the cession of the Philippines. That is the difference between Jefferson the Statesman and Jefferson the Philosopher. The philosopher stated the ideal, which I believe to be the ideal of the American people to-day as fully as it always has been; but the statesman did a great service to his country and to civilization, by doing a wise thing at a fortunate moment, although, in doing it, he contravened his own ideal. I freely admit that if the dilemma with which we have had to deal in the matter of the Philippines had been voluntarily and consciously sought, the outcome would have been discreditable to our good faith and alarming in its portent. Coming as it has, however, as an unintended result of a war with Spain having its origin in disturbances with Cuba, I believe the children have given the answer the fathers would have made in the like case. Unless civilization, under proper conditions, has a right to withhold control from barbarism and semi-barbarism and to substitute for either something better, our own national life rests upon inexcusable wrong to the aborigines whose land we have taken and for whose civilization, such as it was, we have substituted our own.

But others again say, that the American ideal is government "of the people, by the people and for the people," and that, however truly we may give to the Philippine Islands a government for the people, it will not be and cannot be, under our authority, a government of the people and by the people. Undoubtedly in this aspect, also, the fact comes short of the ideal; but to say that, in the premises, we have no duty to civilization or to the Philippine Islanders is to claim that a self-governing Democracy, by its very nature, is incapable of serving other peoples except by its own example. I do not think so meanly of Democracy. Yet I would not admit for a moment, even by implication, that the service of the American Democracy to mankind has been hitherto anything less than a world service. I have no sympathy with any who speak with a certain air of apology of America's isolation in the past. No nation since the American Republic was founded has influenced the

history of all nations more importantly or more beneficially. Indirectly by its influence, and directly by its action, it has done more than any other country to substitute arbitration for war as a means of settling international disputes; while its general success as a self-governing nation, sincerely devoted to the arts of peace, has given a profound impulse to democracy the world over. Neither do I believe that the short and successful war with Spain has changed the temper of our countrymen in a night. The equally successful war with Mexico produced no such result, and the inbred habit of a century is not so easily cast aside. Our mission, indeed, has been a world mission of the highest order. We have invited to our shores men of every European country and many others, to share with us in the development and civilization of a continent. Not even England's mission, with her colonies and dependencies scattered over the earth, has been more wide-reaching than ours. We have asked the people of the civilized world to join with us in developing a continent, and, in doing so, to learn with us the lessons and the art of self-government. We have also invited here the wealth of Christendom to take part in the development of our material resources.

It is noticeable that in the same eventful year of 1898 that has burdened us with new dutles to people across the sea, we have become for the first time a creditor nation lending vast sums of money to the people of Europe. It is a striking and suggestive coincidence that at the very moment when our relations to the civilized world have changed financially, the obligation of duty to outside peoples, less civilized than we are, seems also to have been laid upon us. It is as if a Voice that admits of no remonstrance had said to us, in the plenitude of our prosperity and power: "Hereafter you must heed the call to service both with men and with money, away from home as well as at home." Certainly the change in our political relations is not more striking than that which has taken place in the domain of finance. To me it seems an evidence of the soundness of heart of the American people that they have unflinchingly accepted the heavy burdens devolved upon the nation by reason of the war with Spain; and I do not see in the acceptance of these burdens any unfaithfulness to our past or to what we stand for among the nations of the earth. It is possible, but by no means sure, that our material interests will be benefitted by the course we have pursued. As I interpret the attitude of our people, they have taken up the task which seems to have been laid upon them, not stopping to question closely whether it will be advan-

tageous to themselves or not, but determining to do it as best they can. How heavy a burden it already is, how heavy it may yet be, is witnessed by the mournful echoes of the guns in the Philppines that tell of what it is to stand in the shoes of Spain in the eyes of a semi-barbarous people.

But if they have taken it up as a burden, they are determined no less to convert it into an opportunity, an opportunity to render new service to mankind.

In this discussion I have given no consideration to the constitutional questions involved, partly because, at best, these are matters of opinion, and no opinion that I might express would have any special value; and partly because the treaty with Spain has been ratified, so that we are already involved in whatever constitutional difficulties there are. There is no doubt that war with Spain has confronted us, both as to Porto Rico and the Philippines, to say nothing of Cuba, with questions that are wholly new to our experience. Without attempting to make any fine distinction between colonies and dependencies, some things are written upon this subject on the pages of history in letters of flame, to which we must not shut our eyes. England lost her American colonies, now the United States, because she attempted to control their trade in the interest of England. The mother country, having learned the lesson of this experience, has since become the great colonizing power of the world, because she has appreciated that colonies or dependencies, to be sources of strength, must be administered in their own interest. It is said that the Bourbons never learn from experience; and Spain has evidently lost her possessions in the Antilles and the Philippines because she has continued to do, down to this day, what caused the revolt of the American colonies from Great Britain in 1776. In other words, the colonies and dependencies of Spain have been places to be exploited in the interest of the mother country. The welfare of the colonies themselves has never been permitted to shape their policy or administration. It would be a ghastly act of folly, if, in the face of facts like these, we ourselves repeat with Porto Rico and the Philippines the mistakes which drove our own forefathers into revolution, and which have cost Spain her possessions in both the West Indies and the East. It is not clear that we are wholly free from the danger of precisely this mistake; not that the mistake is likely to be made deliberately and with malice aforethought, but that it may be made thoughtlessly, simply because the point of view, up to this time, has been wholly foreign to our vision. Our navigation laws, for instance, which confine the privileges of domestic commerce to vessels

carrying the American flag, have been already extended to Hawaii and to Porto Rico. Looking at these places as parts of American territory, the action is natural enough; but if the policy be questioned from the point of view of Hawaii and of Porto Rico, it is by no means so clear that the policy is wise. Hawaii lies as far from our Western shores as Southampton from New York. Porto Rico is half as far away. It is certainly a fair question for the inhabitants of Hawaii and of Porto Rico to ask what benefit they obtain from a policy which will arbitrarily confine their trade with this country to vessels carrying the flag of the United States. Our navigation laws have their origin in a conception of national advantage which affords justification for them from our own point of view; but I submit that the application of such laws to islands lying 1,500 miles and 3,000 miles away from our nearest port may wear a very different aspect to the inhabitants of those islands from what it wears to us.

Similarly, the tariff question is a question of vital importance from the same point of view. These islands are not now manufacturing centers, nor are they very likely to become so. It is evident, therefore, that the tariff for the Philippines and the tariff for Porto Rico might easily be one thing, if framed from the point of view of the islands, or another thing if framed from the point of view of the United States. We ought not to forget, and I hope we shall not forget, that it was questions of this kind,—not precisely the same in form, but similar in tendency,—which led to our own revolution against Great Britain. I am sanguine enough to believe that, in the long run, our policy towards Porto Rico and the Philippines in these respects will be guided by the principles for which our own fathers contended; but there is undoubtedly a momentary danger growing out of the fact that the whole question is entirely new to our habits of thought. It is not an easy thing for a nation which has consistently pursued for a hundred years a policy of self-development to put itself suddenly in the place of distant islands with whose interests it is really unacquainted in any fundamental sense of the word.

The action of the President in sending a well constituted Commission to the Philippines to report upon these very subjects is worthy of the highest commendation. A similar Commission, equally well constituted, might do equally good service in acquainting us with the problems with which we have to deal in Porto Rico. The West Indian Islands seem so near that it is natural to think of them as part of the American continent, and indeed they are much closer to us

L. of C.

in all their interests than are the Philippines. On the other hand, Porto Rico, measured by miles, is really far away, and its historic development is as different from ours as possible. Because it is so naturally a part of the American continent we are apt to think that we know all about it, whereas our true wisdom lies, I am sure, in endeavoring to acquaint ourselves with its needs in the most careful manner possible.

In this connection, I am glad to emphasize a suggestion which President Gilman formulated a few months ago, that the universities of the country can render service of the highest value by encouraging their advanced students to look into all of these questions. The thing to be feared at the hands of the American people, in these new relations, is not so much mistakes of the heart as mistakes of the head,—mistakes that will be made either because we fancy that we know what we do not know, or because it has not seemed worth while for us to take the trouble to learn. Therefore every contribution of knowledge that tends to the understanding of the problem will be most helpful, and in no quarter can we more hopefully look for such contributions than to the universities and to the investigations of their advanced students of history and economics.

You will not imagine, I am sure, because I have emphasized first of all what seems to me a real danger in the situation, that I have any doubt as to the great service which the United States can do for the population of all of these islands, both in the West and in the East. We can give to them undoubtedly many of the things that we ourselves value most highly. We can give to them free schools and free speech; freedom to worship God according to their own conscience; and equality before the law. We can give to them, if we will, the opportunities that are born of a stable government, justly and equitably administered; and certainly we can and we should develop everywhere the capacity for self-government up to the utmost limit of possibility. I have not the slightest doubt that these are the things which the American people as a whole intend to do for these islands which have come so unexpectedly under our influence. Neither have I any doubt that the most self-sacrificing efforts will be made by multitudes of our people to give both to Porto Rico and the Philippines, as well as to Cuba, of the very best that we have.

It ought not to be forgotten, however, that it is one thing to intend to do a thing, and quite another thing to accomplish it. I have not the slightest doubt that a people who have maintained Robert College in Constantinople for so many years, the influence of which, in due time, undoubtedly

led to the freedom of Bulgaria and Roumania from the Turkish yoke, will carry the torch of education far and wide throughout these islands. I have equally little doubt that the spirit of our laws will be embodied in any legislative action that we may take with reference to these islands. The critical question is, what sort of administration shall we provide during the period, whether it be long or short, in which we must be ourselves directly responsible for results. If we want instruction on an engineering subject we must go to an engineer; and if we want information on a question of commerce or of agriculture we must go to men who have made a careful study of the problems in business or farming about which we wish to know. Similarly, if we want to learn how to administer colonies and dependencies wisely, we must study the methods of the one great power of modern times which has made a good record in this field of enterprise. We may indeed study also, and we should, the efforts of other countries in similar directions which have been less successful; for, by such a comparative study of the question, we shall be able to learn absolutely the conditions upon which success in these enterprises depends. Such a survey of the history of the colonies and dependencies of our time will lead us surely to one conclusion,—that if we are to do any real kindness to these distant people whose lot is now measurably identified with our own, and if we wish to avoid occasions for shame which will make us a by-word among the nations, we must develop a colonial service with permanency of tenure that will offer a life career to many of the talented and promising men of the land. No country in the world, not even England, I believe, abounds more richly in the material available for such a service; but you cannot obtain the services of such men unless you make the conditions of the service such as will attract them. The Supreme Court of the United States has always been able to command the services of many of the best legal minds in the country,—not because a position on the Bench of the Supreme Court pays a large salary, for it does not; but because of the honor of the position, because of its permanency of tenure, and because of its provision for old age. If you were to subtract from these conditions the permanency of tenure, the quality of the Judges composing the Supreme Court of the United States would suffer a rapid and fatal deterioration. If you were to deduct both the permanency of tenure and the provision for old age, not even the high honor of the appointment could long secure the quality of service, even in this highest court of the nation, which we have enjoyed in the past.

Similarly, a colonial service that is constantly changing, and which offers no permanent career to young men of promise who may embark upon it, is as sure to be a failure as anything can be. It is indeed one of the great drawbacks to the public service of the United States in any capacity, that it does not offer, under existing conditions, to young men who are inclined to follow it, a permanent career, simply upon the basis of good service to the public. Something may be learned even from Tammany Hall in this regard, which does offer permanency of opportunity, in one form or another, to those who are loyal to the organization. The difficulty is, in this case, that the permanency comes from loyalty to the organization, not from efficient and loyal service to the commonwealth. Tammany also demands for its own service peculiar efficiency and skill. Some day the people will realize that they cannot afford to be less careful of their own interests than Tammany is of its own. When this day comes the people will not only create but sustain, in all departments of the public service, a system that will make it worth while for young men of promise to enter into the service of the State and of the community with the expectation of making that their life work. It must be made their life work upon conditions, also, that make permanency of tenure depend on service to the public, not upon service to any political organization less comprehensive than the public. Unless we can do this for our colonies, we shall add only one more failure to the melancholy history of colonial enterprise. If we do it for our colonies, we may well hope that the demonstrated advantage of it will tend to elevate and improve our own civil service at home.

Looking out upon the country at the present time, we must thankfully recognize that we are passing through an era of almost unexampled prosperity. Our arms have been crowned with brilliant victory both on sea and land in our recent war with Spain; and our trade and industry, as shown by the phenomenal record of exports and of imports, have won almost as decisive victories in all the markets of the world. In contemplation of these peaceful achievements, one may indeed exclaim, "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than War." Such a moment is a moment of great opportunity and of peculiar danger. The danger is that the ideal life of the nation shall suffer hurt in the presence of such abounding prosperity. If it is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God, it is no less hard for a rich nation. It is pleasant, when wealth increases, to strive for more wealth; and it is easy, in the midst of plenty, to leave the hard tasks of the

world to others. In this light I think we may well be grateful, rather than disturbed that, at a time when our material prosperity is so conspicuous, there should have been laid upon our shoulders some of the burdens of the world that our brothers across the sea have been carrying in the effort to improve and elevate the civilization of the race. It may well be true, in the Providence of God, that this young nation, inhabiting a continent, which has so far mastered its material environment as to become a creditor nation, must owe return in service as well as money, directly as well as indirectly, to the cause of civilization throughout the world. I plead especially with the young men at a time like this to keep bright their high ideals; to be willing to serve society and the State as Washington did, unselfishly, and not to permit themselves to be warped by any allurement of wealth from this ideal service. If there be, also, here men who are wealthy as well as young, I beg them to consecrate wealth and life alike to this ideal service. The country at home and abroad needs such service in a thousand forms.

"Then, welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!
Be our joys three parts pain!
Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe!"

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 903 243 3